The next-to-minimal weights of binary projective Reed-Muller codes

Cícero Carvalho and V. G. Lopez Neumann[1]

Faculdade de Matemática, Universidade Federal de Uberlândia, Av. J. N. Ávila 2121, 38.408-902 Uberlândia - MG, Brazil

arXiv:1701.01658v1 [cs.IT] 6 Jan 2017

Abstract. Projective Reed-Muller codes were introduced by Lachaud, in 1988 and their dimension and minimum distance were determined by Serre and Sørensen in 1991. In coding theory one is also interested in the higher Hamming weights, to study the code performance. Yet, not many values of the higher Hamming weights are known for these codes, not even the second lowest weight (also known as next-to-minimal weight) is completely determined. In this paper we determine all the values of the next-to-minimal weight for the binary projective Reed-Muller codes, which we show to be equal to the next-to-minimal weight of Reed-Muller codes in most, but not all, cases.

1 Introduction

The so-called Reed-Muller codes appeared in 1954, when they were defined by D.E. Muller ([9]) and given a decoding algorithm by I.S. Reed ([10]). They were codes defined over $\mathbb{F}_2$ and in 1968 Kasami, Lin, and Peterson ([5]) extended the original definition to a finite field $\mathbb{F}_q$, where q is any prime power. They named these codes "generalized Reed-Muller codes" and presented some results on the weight distribution, the dimension of the codes being determined in later works. In coding theory one is always interested in the values of the higher Hamming weights of a code because of their relationship with the code performance, but usually this is not a simple problem. For the generalized Reed-Muller codes, the complete determination of the second lowest Hamming weight, also called next-to-minimal weight, was only completed in 2010, when Bruen ([1]) observed that the value of these weights could be obtained from unpublished results in the Ph.D. thesis of D. Erickson ([3]) and Bruen's own results from 1992 and 2006.

Twenty years after the definition of the generalized Reed-Muller codes the class of projective Reed-Muller codes was introduced by Lachaud ([6]). The parameters of these codes were determined by Serre ([16]), for some cases, and by Sørensen ([17]) for the general case, and they proved that the minimum distance of the projective Reed-Muller

[1]Authors' emails: cicero@ufu.br and victor.neumann@ufu.br. Both authors were partially supported by grants from CNPq and FAPEMIG.
Published in IEEE Transactions on Information Theory, vol. 62, issue 11, Nov. 2016.
http://doi.org/10.1109/TIT.2016.2611527

codes of order d is equal to the minimum distance of the generalized Reed-Muller code of order $d-1$ (see (2.1)). The determination of the next-to-minimal weight for these codes is yet to be done, and there are some results (also about higher Hamming weights) on this subject by Rodier and Sboui ([12], [13], [15]) and also by Ballet and Rolland ([2]). In this paper we present all the values of the next-to-minimal weights for the case of binary projective Reed-Muller codes. Interestingly, we note that the next-to-minimal weight of the binary projective Reed-Muller codes of order d is equal to the next-to-minimal weight of the Reed-Muller codes of order $d-1$ in most but not all cases (see Theorem 3.1). In the next section we recall the definitions of the generalized and projective Reed-Muller codes, and prove some results of geometrical nature that will allow us to determine the next-to-minimal weight of the binary projective Reed-Muller codes, which is done in the last section.

2 Preliminary results

Let $\mathbb{F}_q$ be a finite field and let $I_q = (X_1^q - X_1, \ldots, X_n^q - X_n) \subset \mathbb{F}_q[X_1, \ldots, X_n]$ be the ideal of polynomials which vanish at all points $P_1, \ldots, P_{q^n}$ of the affine space $\mathbb{A}^n(\mathbb{F}_q)$. Let $\varphi : \mathbb{F}_q[X_1, \ldots, X_n]/I_q \to \mathbb{F}_q^{q^n}$ be the $\mathbb{F}_q$-linear transformation given by $\varphi(g + I_q) = (g(P_1), \ldots, g(P_{q^n}))$.

Definition 2.1 Let d be a nonnegative integer. The generalized Reed-Muller code of order d is defined as $\mathrm{RM}(n,d) = \{\varphi(g + I_q) \,|\, g = 0 \text{ or } \deg(g) \leq d\}$.

One may show that $\mathrm{RM}(n,d) = \mathbb{F}_q^{q^n}$ if $d \geq n(q-1)$, so in this case the minimum distance is 1. Let $d \leq n(q-1)$ and write $d = a(q-1) + b$ with $0 < b \leq q-1$, then the minimum distance of $\mathrm{RM}(n,d)$ is

$$W_{\mathrm{RM}}^{(1)}(n,d) = (q-b)q^{n-a-1}.$$

The next-to-minimal weight $W_{\mathrm{RM}}^{(2)}(n,d)$ of $\mathrm{RM}(n,d)$ is equal to

$$W_{\mathrm{RM}}^{(2)}(n,d) = (q-b)q^{n-a-1} + cq^{n-a-2} = \left(1 + \frac{c}{(q-b)q}\right)(q-b)q^{n-a-1}$$

where c is equal to $b-1$, $q-1$ or q, according to the values of q and d (see [2, Theorems 9 and 10]). We will quote specific values of $W_{\mathrm{RM}}^{(2)}(n,d)$ when we need them.

Let $Q_1, \ldots, Q_N$ be the points of $\mathbb{P}^n(\mathbb{F}_q)$, where $N = q^n + \ldots + q + 1$. It is known (see e.g. [8] or [11]) that the homogeneous ideal $J_q \subset \mathbb{F}_q[X_0, \ldots, X_n]$ of the polynomials

which vanish in all points of $\mathbb{P}^n(\mathbb{F}_q)$ is generated by $\{X_j^q X_i - X_i^q X_j \,|\, 0 \leq i < j \leq n\}$. We denote by $\mathbb{F}_q[X_0, \ldots, X_n]_d$ (respectively, $(J_q)_d$) the $\mathbb{F}_q$-vector subspace formed by the homogeneous polynomials of degree d (together with the zero polynomial) in $\mathbb{F}_q[X_0, \ldots, X_n]$ (respectively, J_q).

Definition 2.2 Let d be a positive integer and let $\psi : \mathbb{F}_q[X_0, \ldots, X_n]_d/(J_q)_d \to \mathbb{F}_q^N$ be the $\mathbb{F}_q$-linear transformation given by $\psi(f + (J_q)_d) = (f(Q_1) \ldots, f(Q_n))$, where we write the points of $\mathbb{P}^n(\mathbb{F}_q)$ in the standard notation, i.e. the first nonzero entry from the left is equal to 1. The projective Reed-Muller code of order d, denoted by $\mathrm{PRM}(n, d)$, is the image of ψ.

The minimum distance $W^{(1)}_{\mathrm{PRM}}(n, d)$ of $\mathrm{PRM}(n, d)$ was determined by Serre ([16]) and Sørensen (see [17]) who proved that

$$W^{(1)}_{\mathrm{PRM}}(n, d) = W^{(1)}_{\mathrm{RM}}(n, d-1). \tag{2.1}$$

Let ω be the Hamming weight of $\varphi(g + I_q)$, where $g \in \mathbb{F}_q[X_1, \ldots, X_n]$ is a polynomial of degree $d-1$, and let $g^{(h)}$ be the homogenization of g with respect to X_0. Then the degree of $g^{(h)}$ is $d-1$ and the weight of $\psi(X_0 g^{(h)} + (J_q)_d)$ is ω. This shows that, denoting by $W^{(2)}_{\mathrm{PRM}}(n, d)$ the next-to-minimal weight of $\mathrm{PRM}(n, d)$, we have

$$W^{(2)}_{\mathrm{PRM}}(n, d) \leq W^{(2)}_{\mathrm{RM}}(n, d-1). \tag{2.2}$$

In the next section we will prove that, for binary projective Reed-Muller codes, equality holds in most but not all cases (see Theorem 3.1).

Definition 2.3 Let $f \in \mathbb{F}_q[X_0, \ldots, X_n]_d$. The set of points of $\mathbb{P}^n(\mathbb{F}_q)$ which are not zeros of f is called the support of f, and we denote its cardinality by $|f|$ (hence $|f|$ is the weight of the codeword $\psi(f + (J_q)_d)$).

Lemma 2.4 *Let $f \in \mathbb{F}_q[X_0, \ldots, X_n]_d$ be a nonzero polynomial, and let S be it support. Let $G \subset \mathbb{P}^n(\mathbb{F}_q)$ be a linear subspace of dimension r, with $r \in \{1, \ldots, n-1\}$, then either $S \cap G = \emptyset$ or $|S \cap G| \geq W^{(1)}_{PRM}(r, d)$.*

Proof: After a projective transformation we may assume that G is given by $X_{r+1} = \cdots = X_n = 0$. Assume that $|S \cap G| \neq \emptyset$ and let g be the polynomial obtained from f by evaluating $X_i = 0$ for $i = r+1, \ldots, n$. Then g is a nonzero homogeneous polynomial of degree d and its support is equal to $S \cap G$. Considering g as a polynomial which evaluates at points of $\mathbb{P}^r(\mathbb{F}_q)$ we have $|S \cap G| = |g| \geq W^{(1)}_{\mathrm{PRM}}(r, d)$. □

Observe that when $d = 1$ we do not have a next-to-minimal weight for $\mathrm{PRM}(n, 1)$ since all hyperplanes in $\mathbb{P}^n(\mathbb{F}_q)$ have the same number of zeros. In [17, Remark 3] Sørensen proved that $\mathrm{PRM}(n, d) = \mathbb{F}_q^N$ whenever $d \geq n(q-1)+1$, so from now on we assume that $2 \leq d \leq n(q-1)$.

Lemma 2.5 *Let $f \in \mathbb{F}_q[X_0, \ldots, X_n]_d$ be a polynomial with a nonempty support S. If there exists a hyperplane $H \subset \mathbb{P}^n(\mathbb{F}_q)$ such that $S \cap H = \emptyset$ and $|f| > W^{(1)}_{PRM}(n, d)$ then $|f| \geq W^{(2)}_{RM}(n, d-1)$.*

Proof: After a projective transformation we may assume that H is the hyperplane defined by $X_0 = 0$. Writing $f = X_0 f_1 + f_2$, where $f_1 \in \mathbb{F}_q[X_0, \ldots, X_n]_{d-1}$ and $f_2 \in \mathbb{F}_q[X_1, \ldots, X_n]_d$, from $S \cap H = \emptyset$ we get that f_2 vanishes on H and a fortiori on $\mathbb{P}^n(\mathbb{F}_q)$, so $f_2 \in J_q$. Let g be the polynomial obtained from f_1 by evaluating $X_0 = 1$, then g is not zero (otherwise $S = \emptyset$) and $\deg(g) \leq d-1$. Considering g as a polynomial which evaluates at $\mathbb{A}^n(\mathbb{F}_q)$ we see that the number $|g|$ of points where g is not zero is equal to $|f|$. Since $|f| > W^{(1)}_{\mathrm{PRM}}(n, d) = W^{(1)}_{\mathrm{RM}}(n, d-1)$ we must have $|g| \geq W^{(2)}_{\mathrm{RM}}(n, d-1)$. $\square$

In what follows the integers k and ℓ will always be the ones uniquely defined by the equality

$$d - 1 = k(q-1) + \ell$$

with $0 \leq k \leq n-1$ and $0 < \ell \leq q-1$. Then, from the data on the minimum distance of $\mathrm{RM}(n, d)$ we get, for $0 \leq r \leq n$, that

$$W^{(1)}_{\mathrm{PRM}}(r, d) = W^{(1)}_{\mathrm{RM}}(r, d-1) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } 0 \leq r \leq k; \\ (q-\ell)q^{r-k-1} & \text{if } k < r \leq n\,. \end{cases}$$

Proposition 2.6 *Let $S \subset \mathbb{P}^n(\mathbb{F}_q)$ be a nonempty set and assume that S has the following properties:*

1. $|S| < \left(1 + \dfrac{1}{q}\right)(q-\ell)q^{n-k-1}$.
2. *For every linear subspace $G \subset \mathbb{P}^n(\mathbb{F}_q)$ of dimension s, with $s \in \{1, \ldots, n-1\}$, either $S \cap G = \emptyset$ or $|S \cap G| \geq W^{(1)}_{PRM}(s, d)$.*

Then there exists a hyperplane $H \subset \mathbb{P}^n(\mathbb{F}_q)$ such that $S \cap H = \emptyset$.

Proof: We start by noting that

$$|S| < \left(1 + \frac{1}{q}\right)(q-\ell)q^{n-k-1} = \left(q - \ell + 1 - \frac{\ell}{q}\right) q^{n-k-1} < q^{n-k} \leq q^n < |\mathbb{P}^n(\mathbb{F}_q)|\,,$$

so let $0 \leq r < n$ be the largest integer such that there is a linear subspace $F \subset \mathbb{P}^n(\mathbb{F}_q)$ of dimension r satisfying $S \cap F = \emptyset$, we want to show that $r = n-1$. Let

$$\mathcal{G}_F = \{G \text{ a linear subspace of } \mathbb{P}^n(\mathbb{F}_q) \mid F \subset G \text{ and } \dim G = r+1\}.$$

The intersection of two distinct elements of $\mathcal{G}_F$ is F, $|G| = (q^{r+2}-1)/(q-1)$ for all $G \in \mathcal{G}_F$ and any point of $\mathbb{P}^n(\mathbb{F}_q)$ outside F belongs to some $G \in \mathcal{G}_F$ hence

$$|\mathcal{G}_F| \left(\frac{q^{r+2}-1}{q-1} - \frac{q^{r+1}-1}{q-1} \right) + \frac{q^{r+1}-1}{q-1} = \frac{q^{n+1}-1}{q-1}$$

and we get $|\mathcal{G}_F| = (q^{n-r}-1)/(q-1)$. From $S = \bigcup_{G \in \mathcal{G}_F} (S \cap G)$, $S \cap F = \emptyset$ and property 2 we get

$$|S| = \sum_{G \in \mathcal{G}_F} |S \cap G| \geq \frac{q^{n-r}-1}{q-1} \cdot W^{(1)}_{\mathrm{PRM}}(r+1, d).$$

Assume that $r < k$, then $W^{(1)}_{\mathrm{PRM}}(r+1, d) = 1$ and from property 1 we get $(q^{n-r}-1)/(q-1) < (1+1/q)(q-\ell)q^{n-k-1}$. Since the left-hand side decreases with r we plug in $r = k-1$ and get

$$\frac{q^{n-k+1}-1}{q-1} = q^{n-k} + \cdots + q + 1 < \left(q - \ell + 1 - \frac{\ell}{q} \right) q^{n-k-1} \leq q^{n-k} - q^{n-k-2}$$

which is absurd. Now we assume that $k \leq r \leq n-1$, and again from property 1 we get

$$\frac{q^{n-r}-1}{q-1}(q-\ell)q^{r-k} < \left(1 + \frac{1}{q}\right)(q-\ell)q^{n-k-1},$$

hence $q^{n-r} - 1 < q^{n-r} - q^{n-r-2}$ which is only possible when $r = n-1$. □

Proposition 2.7 *Let $S \subset \mathbb{P}^n(\mathbb{F}_q)$ be a nonempty set and assume that S has the following properties:*

1. $|S| \leq \left(1 + \dfrac{1}{(q-\ell)}\right)(q-\ell)q^{n-k-1} = (q-\ell+1)q^{n-k-1}$.
2. *For every linear subspace $G \subset \mathbb{P}^n(\mathbb{F}_q)$ of dimension s, with $s \in \{1, \ldots, n-1\}$, either $S \cap G = \emptyset$ or $|S \cap G| \geq W^{(1)}_{PRM}(s, d)$.*

Then there exists $r \geq k$ and a linear subspace $H_r \subset \mathbb{P}^n(\mathbb{F}_q)$ of dimension r such that $S \cap H_r = \emptyset$.

Proof: We start as in the proof of the previous Lemma, and observe that

$$|S| \leq (q-\ell+1)q^{n-k-1} \leq q^{n-k} \leq q^n < |\mathbb{P}^n(\mathbb{F}_q)|\,,$$

so let $0 \leq r < n$ be the largest integer such that there is a linear subspace $F \subset \mathbb{P}^n(\mathbb{F}_q)$ of dimension r satisfying $S \cap F = \emptyset$. Let

$$\mathcal{G}_F = \{G \text{ a linear subspace of } \mathbb{P}^n(\mathbb{F}_q) \mid F \subset G \text{ and } \dim G = r+1\}\,,$$

as before we have $|\mathcal{G}_F| = (q^{n-r}-1)/(q-1)$ and

$$|S| = \sum_{G \in \mathcal{G}_F} |S \cap G| \geq \frac{q^{n-r}-1}{q-1} \cdot W^{(1)}_{\mathrm{PRM}}(r+1,d)\,.$$

Assume that $r < k$, then $W^{(1)}_{\mathrm{PRM}}(r+1,d) = 1$ and from property 1 we get

$$\frac{q^{n-r}-1}{q-1} = q^{n-r-1} + \cdots + 1 \leq (q-\ell+1)q^{n-k-1} = q^{n-k} - (\ell-1)q^{n-k-1} \leq q^{n-r-1}$$

which is absurd, so we must have $k \leq r \leq n-1$. □

3 Main results

In this section we determine the next-to-minimal weight for the binary projective Reed-Muller codes. Recall that we are assuming that $2 \leq d \leq n(q-1)$ so if $q = 2$ we have $n \geq 2$. Also, from $d-1 = k(q-1)+\ell$, with $0 \leq k \leq n-1$ and $0 < \ell \leq q-1$ we see that when $q = 2$ we have $\ell = 1$ and $d-1 = k+1$, so from $2 \leq d \leq n$ we get $0 \leq k \leq n-2$. We recall that from [2, Theorem 9] we have

$$W^{(2)}_{\mathrm{RM}}(n,d-1) = \begin{cases} 2^n & \text{if } \ k=0 \\ 3\cdot 2^{n-k-2} & \text{if } \ 0<k<n-2 \\ 4 & \text{if } \ k=n-2. \end{cases}$$

Theorem 3.1 *Let $q = 2$ and write $d-1 = k+1$. If $0 < k < n-2$ or $k = n-2 \geq 0$, then*

$$W^{(2)}_{PRM}(n,d) = W^{(2)}_{RM}(n,d-1),$$

and if $k = 0$ and $n \geq 3$ then

$$W^{(2)}_{PRM}(n,d) = 3\cdot 2^{n-2} < W^{(2)}_{RM}(n,d-1).$$

Proof: We start with the case where $k = 0$ and $n \geq 3$. Let $f \in \mathbb{F}_q[X_0, \ldots, X_n]_d$ be a nonzero polynomial such that

$$0 \neq |f| < \left(1 + \frac{1}{2}\right) W^{(1)}_{\mathrm{PRM}}(n, d)$$

and observe that

$$\left(1 + \frac{1}{2}\right) W^{(1)}_{\mathrm{PRM}}(n, d) = 3 \cdot 2^{n-2} < W^{(2)}_{\mathrm{RM}}(n, d-1) = 2^n.$$

Let S be the support of f, then S has property 1 of Proposition 2.6 and from Lemma 2.4 it also has property 2 so there exists a hyperplane $H \subset \mathbb{P}^n(\mathbb{F}_q)$ such that $S \cap H = \emptyset$ and from Lemma 2.5 we must have $|f| = W^{(1)}_{\mathrm{PRM}}(n, d)$. This shows that

$$3 \cdot 2^{n-2} \leq W^{(2)}_{\mathrm{PRM}}(n, d),$$

and let $g = X_0X_3 + X_1X_2$. Let $\widetilde{H}_{n-2}$ be the linear subspace defined by $X_0 = X_1 = 0$ and note that the support of g does not meet $\widetilde{H}_{n-2}$. Counting the number of hyperplanes that contain $\widetilde{H}_{n-2}$ (as in the proof of Proposition 2.6) we get that a total of three hyperplanes, which we call G_0, G_1 and G_2, whose equations are, respectively, $X_0 = 0$, $X_1 = 0$ and $X_0 + X_1 = 0$. Now it is easy to check that in each of these hyperplanes we have 2^{n-2} points in the support of g, hence $|g| = 3 \cdot 2^{n-2}$, which settles this case.

Assume now that k is in the range $0 < k < n - 2$, and for $d = k + 2$ let $f \in \mathbb{F}_q[X_0, \ldots, X_n]_d$ be a nonzero polynomial such that

$$0 \neq |f| < \left(1 + \frac{1}{2}\right) 2^{n-k-1}$$

(we observe that such a polynomial exists because $W^{(1)}_{\mathrm{PRM}}(n, d) = 2^{n-k-1}$). Let S be the support of f, then S has property 1 of Proposition 2.6 and from Lemma 2.4 it also has property 2 so there exists a hyperplane $H \subset \mathbb{P}^n(\mathbb{F}_q)$ such that $S \cap H = \emptyset$. From Lemma 2.5 we have that either $|f| = W^{(1)}_{\mathrm{PRM}}(n, d)$ or $|f| \geq W^{(2)}_{\mathrm{RM}}(n, d-1)$. Note that $W^{(2)}_{\mathrm{RM}}(n, d-1) = 3 \cdot 2^{n-k-2} = (1 + 1/2)2^{n-k-1}$, so we may conclude that $W^{(2)}_{\mathrm{PRM}}(n, d) \geq W^{(2)}_{\mathrm{RM}}(n, d-1)$, and we have already remarked in (2.2) that $W^{(2)}_{\mathrm{PRM}}(n, d) \leq W^{(2)}_{\mathrm{RM}}(n, d-1)$.

Now we assume that $k = n - 2 \geq 0$, and let $f \in \mathbb{F}_q[X_0, \ldots, X_n]_d$ be a nonzero polynomial such that $0 \neq |f| \leq 4$ (such polynomial exists because $W^{(1)}_{\mathrm{PRM}}(n, d) = 2$ in this case, where $d = n$). Then we may apply Proposition 2.7 and find that there exists a linear subspace H_r of dimension $r \geq n - 2$ such that $H_r \cap S = \emptyset$.

If $r = n-1$ then lemma 2.5 implies that $|f| = W^{(1)}_{\mathrm{PRM}}(n,d)$ or $|f| \geq W^{(2)}_{\mathrm{RM}}(n,d-1)$, and were done because from (2.2) we know that $W^{(2)}_{\mathrm{PRM}}(n,d) \leq W^{(2)}_{\mathrm{RM}}(n,d-1)$. Thus we assume that $r = n-2$ and after a projective transformation, if necessary, we assume that H_{n-2} is the linear subspace defined by $X_0 = X_1 = 0$. As above we have three hyperplanes which contain H_{n-2}, which we call G_0, G_1, G_2, and whose equations are, respectively, $X_0 = 0$, $X_1 = 0$ and $X_0 + X_1 = 0$. Since $|S \cap G_i| \geq 1$ for $i = 0,1,2$ we get that $|f| \geq 3 > W^{(1)}_{\mathrm{PRM}}(n,d) = 2$ (recall that $d = n$). Thus $3 \leq |f| \leq 4$ and we want to prove that $|f| = 4 = W^{(2)}_{\mathrm{RM}}(n,d-1)$.

Let's assume, by means of absurd, that $|f| = 3$, so that $|S \cap G_i| = 1$ for $i = 0,1,2$ and let $(0:1:Q_0)$, $(1:0:Q_1)$ and $(1:1:Q_2)$ be the points of intersection of S with G_0, G_1 and G_2 respectively. Write f as $f = X_0(X_1 f_2 + f_1) + X_1 f_0 + f_3$, with $f_2 \in \mathbb{F}_q[X_0,\ldots,X_n]_{d-2}$, $f_1 \in \mathbb{F}_q[X_0,X_2,\ldots,X_n]_{d-1}$, $f_0 \in \mathbb{F}_q[X_1,\ldots,X_n]_{d-1}$ and $f_3 \in \mathbb{F}_q[X_2,\ldots,X_n]_d$. Since f vanishes on H_{n-2} we get that f_3 vanishes on H_{n-2} and a fortiori on $\mathbb{P}^n(\mathbb{F}_q)$, so we may assume that $f = X_0(X_1 f_2 + f_1) + X_1 f_0$. From the definitions of Q_0, Q_1 and Q_2 we get that $f_0(1,Q_0) = 1$, $f_1(1,Q_1) = 1$ and

$$g(Q_2) := f_2(1,1,Q_2) + f_1(1,Q_2) + f_0(1,Q_2) = 1.$$

Observe that $f_2(1,1,X_2,\ldots,X_n)$ is the zero polynomial or a polynomial of degree $d-2 = n-2$ taking values on $\mathbb{A}^{n-1}(\mathbb{F}_q)$, and in the latter case we have that either

$$|f_2(1,1,X_2,\ldots,X_n)| = W^{(1)}_{\mathrm{RM}}(n-1,n-2) = 2$$

or

$$|f_2(1,1,X_2,\ldots,X_n)| \geq W^{(2)}_{\mathrm{RM}}(n-1,n-2) = 4. \tag{3.1}$$

We cannot have $f_2(1,1,X_2,\ldots,X_n) = 0$ otherwise, if $Q_0 \neq Q_1$ we would have $g(Q_0) = f_0(1,Q_0) = 1$ and $g(Q_1) = f_1(1,Q_1) = 1$, and if $Q_0 = Q_1$ then $g(Q) = 0$ for all $Q \in \mathbb{A}^{n-1}(\mathbb{F}_q)$, so in both cases we have a contradiction with $|S \cap G_2| = 1$. So we assume that $f_2(1,1,X_2,\ldots,X_n) \neq 0$ and in what follows we show that also in this case we cannot have $|S \cap G_2| = 1$, which will conclude the proof that $|f| = 4$. We split the proof in two parts.
I)Suppose that $f_2(1,1,Q_2) = 0$, from $g(Q_2) = 1$ we must have $Q_2 = Q_0$ or $Q_2 = Q_1$, and $Q_0 \neq Q_1$. We will assume that $Q_2 = Q_0$, the case where $Q_2 = Q_1$ being similar. We know that there are at least two distinct points $Q_3, Q_4 \in \mathbb{A}^{n-1}(\mathbb{F}_q)$ such that $f_2(1,1,Q_i) = 1$ for $i = 3,4$. Clearly $Q_3 \neq Q_2$, if $Q_3 \neq Q_1$ we get $g(Q_3) = 1$ and if $Q_3 = Q_1$ then $Q_4 \neq Q_1$, $Q_4 \neq Q_2 = Q_0$ and $g(Q_4) = 1$, so $|S \cap G_2| > 1$.
II) Now we assume that $f_2(1,1,Q_2) = 1$, from $g(Q_2) = 1$ we get that either $Q_2 = Q_0 = Q_1$, or $Q_2 \neq Q_0$ and $Q_2 \neq Q_1$. From $|f_2(1,1,X_2,\ldots,X_n)| \geq 2$ we know that there exists $Q_3 \neq Q_2$ such that $f_2(1,1,Q_3) = 1$, so if $Q_2 = Q_0 = Q_1$ then $g(Q_3) = 1$ and $|S \cap G_2| > 1$.

Thus we assume now that $Q_2 \neq Q_0$ and $Q_2 \neq Q_1$. If $Q_0 = Q_1$ then in both cases $Q_3 = Q_0 = Q_1$ or $Q_3 \neq Q_0 = Q_1$ we have $g(Q_3) = 1$. So now we consider the case where $Q_0 \neq Q_1$. If $Q_3 \notin \{Q_0, Q_1\}$ then $g(Q_3) = 1$, if $Q_3 \in \{Q_0, Q_1\}$, say $Q_3 = Q_0$ (the case where $Q_3 = Q_1$ is similar) then $g(Q_1) = 1$ when $f_2(1, 1, Q_1) = 0$, if $f_2(1, 1, Q_1) = 1$ then we already have three distinct points of $\mathbb{A}^{n-1}(\mathbb{F}_q)$ which are not zeros of $f_2(1, 1, X_2, \ldots, X_n)$ (namely, Q_1, Q_2 and Q_3) so from inequality (3.1) above there is a point $\widetilde{Q}$, distinct from Q_1, Q_2 and $Q_3 = Q_0$ such that $f_2(1, 1, \widetilde{Q}) = 1$, hence $g(\widetilde{Q}) = 1$ and again $|S \cap G_2| > 1$. This completes the proof of the case $k = n - 2$ and of the Theorem. □

In [4] Delsarte et al. proved that the codewords of minimal weight in $\mathrm{RM}(n, d)$ are such that their support is the union of certain affine subspaces of $\mathbb{F}_q^{q^n}$, or equivalently, that these codewords may be obtained as the evaluation of polynomials whose classes in $\mathbb{F}_q[X_1, \ldots, X_n]/I_q$ may be represented by the product of d polynomials of degree 1. In [7] the author proves a similar result for the next-to-minimal codewords of $\mathrm{RM}(n, d)$, in the case where $q \geq 3$. In [14] (see also [2]) the author proves that also for $\mathrm{PRM}(n, d)$ the minimal weight codewords may be characterized as being the evaluation of certain homogeneous polynomials whose classes in $\mathbb{F}_q[X_0, \ldots, X_n]/J_q$ can be written as the product of linear factors, so that the zeros of such polynomials are over a union of hyperplanes. As a byproduct of the above proof we see that, for $q = 2$, such statement is not true for the support of the next-to-minimal codewords, since in the case where $k = 0$ and $n \geq 3$ we presented a codeword whose zeros form an irreducible quadric in $\mathbb{P}^n(\mathbb{F}_q)$.

References

[1] A. Bruen, Blocking sets and low-weight codewords in the generalized Reed-Muller codes, Contemp. Math. **525** (2010) 161–164.

[2] S. Ballet, R. Rolland, On low weight codewords of generalized affine and projective Reed-Muller codes. Des. Codes Cryptogr. **73**(2) (2014) 271–297.

[3] D. Erickson, Counting zeros of polynomials over finite fields. PhD Thesis, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena (1974).

[4] P. Delsarte, J. Goethals, F. MacWilliams, On generalized Reed-Muller codes and their relatives, Inform. Control **16** (1970) 403–442.

[5] T. Kasami, S. Lin, and W. W. Peterson, New generalizations of the Reed-Muller codes-Part I: Primitive codes, IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory, **14** (1968) 189–199.

[6] G. Lachaud, The parameters of projective Reed-Muller codes, Discrete Math. **81**(2) (1990) 217–221.

[7] E. Leducq, Second weight codewords of generalized Reed-Muller codes, Cryptogr. Commun. **5** (2013) 241–276.

[8] D.-J. Mercier, R. Rolland, Polynômes homogènes qui s'annulent sur l'espace projectif $\mathbb{P}^m(\mathbb{F}_q)$, J. Pure Appl. Algebra **124** (1998) 227–240.

[9] D.E. Muller, Application of boolean algebra to switching circuit design and to error detection, IRE Transactions on Electronic Computers **3** (1954) 6-12.

[10] I.S. Reed, A class of multiple-error-correcting codes and the decoding scheme, Transactions of the IRE Professional Group on Information Theory, **3** (1954) 38-49.

[11] C. Rentería, H. Tapia-Recillas, Reed-Muller codes: an ideal theory approach, Commu. Algebra **25**(2) (1997) 401–413.

[12] F. Rodier, A. Sboui A., Les arrangements minimaux et maximaux d'hyperplans dans $\mathbb{P}^n(\mathbb{F}_q)$, C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris **344** (2007) 287–290.

[13] F. Rodier, A. Sboui A., Highest numbers of points of hypersurfaces over finite fields and generalized Reed-Muller codes, Finite Fields Appl. **14** (2008) 816–822.

[14] R. Rolland, Number of points of non-absolutely irreducible hypersurfaces. Algebraic geometry and its applications, 481–487, Ser. Number Theory Appl. 5, World Sci. Publ., Hackensack, NJ, 2008.

[15] A. Sboui, Special numbers of rational points on hypersurfaces in the n-dimensional projective space over a finite field, Discret. Math. **309** (2009) 5048–5059.

[16] J.P. Serre, Lettre à M. Tsfasman du 24 Juillet 1989. In: Journées arithmétiques de Luminy 17–21 Juillet 1989, Astérisque, 198–200. Société Mathématique de France (1991).

[17] A. Sørensen, Projective Reed-Muller codes, IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory **37**(6) (1991) 1567–1576.